DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 118 HE 005 026

AUTHOR Lauroesch, William; And Others
TITLE Sampling of Perceptions of Participating Faculty in Bachelor's Degree with Individual Concentration Program at the University of Massachusetts.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Degrees (Titles); Educational Innovation; Faculty; *Higher Education; *Individualized Programs; Questionnaires; *Special Degree Programs; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

The Bachelor's Degree with Individual Concentration (BDIC) at the University of Massachusetts allows students to extend learning objectives beyond the classroom by providing greater flexibility in educational choices, more interdisciplinary programs and more individualized options for the students. The purpose of this investigation was to collect and analyze data concerning the perceptions of BDIC faculty on (1) the purpose and scope of the program, (2) the effect of participating in the BDIC program upon faculty teaching style and relationships with students, and (3) the effectiveness of the program's management. The research design for this study was formulated to reflect the basic intention of providing manageable and reliable information for making management decisions for the BDIC program. An interview questionnaire was developed as the survey instrument. Responses to the questionnaire (25) indicate that participating faculty are convinced that the program serves a useful purpose. It would seem from the responses that the program is well managed, adequate support services are available, the Director and his staff are accessible, and there are channels of communication available for making suggestions for program improvement. The survey questionnaire is included. (Author/PG)

ED 086118

SAMPLING OF PERCEPTIONS OF PARTICIPATING FACULTY IN BACHELOR'S DEGREE WITH INDIVIUAL CONCETRATION PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

An Institutional Research Project

Conducted by the

Higher Education Program
Educational Policy Studies
School of Education
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Co-Sponsors

Robert L. Woodbury, Associate Provost for Special Programs
Arthur F. Kinney, Jr., Director, Bachelor's Degree With Individual Concentration

Principal Investigator

William Lauroesch

Research Associates

William Burke
Patricia Crosson
Richard Eldredge
Edward Elmendorf
Sister Ann Luciano
Edward Maclosky
Ernest McNeill
Paul Plourde
Janet Sheppard
Michael Suzor
David Taggart

May, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 005 026

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SAMPLING OF PERCEPTIONS OF PARTICIPATING FACULTY IN BACHELOR'S DEGREE WITH INDIVIDUAL CONCENTRATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

PURPOSE

In May, 1972, the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts approved a program of study entitled, Bachelor's Degree with Individual Concentration (BDIC). Since this time the BDIC program has been formally implemented with specifically stated purposes and operational structures.

Pursuant to consultative agreements and with the approval of the Director of the BDIC program, the study which follows was undertaken by members of the graduate course, Institutional Research and Program Development. This study was designed with two basic intentions in mind: First, to provide the Program Director with data procured by standard research procedures in a form that would be of benefit to the management of the program; second, to provide practical learning tasks for the members of the Institutional Research and Program Development class.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation was to collect and analyze data for the perceptions of the BDIC faculty of (1) the purpose and scope of the program, (2) the effect of participating in the BDIC program upon faculty teaching style and relationships with students, and (3) the

effectiveness of the program's management.

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was formulated to reflect the basic intention of providing manageable and reliable information for making management decisions for the BDIC program. After the purpose and the intended research problem were outlined, appropriate eliciting frames were explored. An interview questionnaire seemed more capable of delivering the data prescribed by the stated research problem than a written, mailed questionnaire. This became especially apparent after the subsequent analysis of demographic data on the BDIC faculty.

An interview questionnaire was developed to draw out faculty perceptions in the three specific areas stated in the research problem. In order to get knowledge about the possible useability of data obtained from this instrument, a pilot test on a small sample of BDIC faculty was administered. Faculty reaction to the structure of the questions and difficulties encountered by the interviewers were recorded. This information was interpreted, and the interview questionnaire was revised to reflect this input where appropriate.

Demographic data on the BDIC faculty in respect to (1) the number of students sponsored, (2) academic rank, (3) sex, and (4) academic discipline, were accumulated. From the total roster of 199 BDIC faculty members, a random sample was chosen using a standard table. The size of the sample was determined by using the square root of the total group as the minimum. This number (14) was tripled (42) to

enhance representation as much as possible within reasonable work-load limits, and then arbitrarily reduced to 36 for even distribution among the members of the 12-man task force. Attrition stemming from abortive attempts to make interview appointments brought the number from whom data were actually collected to 25.

Interview procedures were structured to insure uniform administration. An explanatory memorandum was sent in advance by campus mail, and the interviewers followed up with telephone calls to schedule interview appointments.

A format for compilation and analysis of the data obtained in the interviews was outlined. Categorical constructs for the compilation of responses to each question were designed by each interviewer. These constructs attempted to sort the responses categorically, according to the qualitative and quantitative representativeness in respect to the questions. A review and revision of each interviewer's analysis was instituted.

QUESTIONS USED BY INTERVIEWERS

1. Do you feel that the BDIC program serves a useful purpose?
2. What do you understand the purpose of the BDIC program to be?
3. In your judgment is the BDIC program falling short or fulfilling or exceeding its initial purposes?
4. Is participation in the BDIC program a factor in the reward system of your department?
5. Do you have some general expectations of a student who is participating in the BDIC program?

6. Are your expectations of a non BDIC student any different than your expectations of a BDIC student?

7. Have you ever or would you ever recommend the BDIC program to a student as an alternative to departmental programs?

8. Would you sponsor more BDIC students?

9. Do you feel that your teaching style has changed or do you do anything differently in a class as a result of your participation in the BDIC program?

10. Have you become involved in any joint teaching or team teaching projects or any special problems courses as a result of your involvement in the BDIC program?

11. In your opinion does the director manage the program effectively?

12. Do you feel that the director is accessible? Is the staff?

13. Have you any suggestions for improving the program? If so, were there channels of communication available for making suggestions?

14. Can you indicate any support services which you feel are needed but not provided?

15. How much time do you spend with your BDIC students? Has this proved to be adequate? How much of this time is of an advising nature?

16. Do you feel that the University's curriculum should be restructured to allow for independent study for all students?

17. Should the BDIC program be allowed unlimited growth?

FINDINGS

Question #1: Do you feel that the BDIC program serves a useful purpose?

In response to Question #1, 23 (92%) out of 25 faculty sponsors stated that the program was serving a useful purpose. The other two (8%) faculty sponsors stated, "I have mixed feelings," and "For a small number." There were no negative statements.

Some of the comments from the 23 (92%) faculty sponsors were:

> Particularly useful for intrinsically motivated students.
>
> University needs alternatives which this BDIC program provides.
>
> It gives the student more room to maneuver and achieve his/her educational goals.

The other two statements were:

> In many cases I think it is a way of getting out of requirements. However in some unique cases it does serve its purpose. . . when the student needs something that is not available.
>
> Very useful for a small number of students. Most departments have enough flexibility and programs to satisfy students.

Question #2: What do you understand the purpose of the BDIC program to be?

While it was impossible to quantify responses to Question #2, all responses approximated one of the following six categories:

> Allows students to establish programs not available in existing departments.

Expands learning objectives beyond the classroom.

Allows greater flexibility in educational choices.

Enables students to design a course of study more uniquely suited to their interests.

Provides more individualized options for the student.

Enables a student to develop a more interdisciplinary program.

Question #3: In your judgment, is the BDIC program falling short of fulfilling its purpose?

In regard to Question #3 the following responses were obtained:

fulfilling its purposes	13 (52%)
falling short	4 (16%)
not sure	8 (32%)

The type of interaction the faculty member had with the individual BDIC students seemed to bear relationship to the nature of response to the question. For example, the 52% who indicated it was fulfilling its purpose also indicated a positive reaction to their BDIC students. The unsure faculty said, generally, they had nothing to compare their students with. The 16% that felt the program fell short had very negative feelings about their particular students.

Comment: Since the program has not published any overall report, it was impossible for the faculty involved to have any opinion about the operation of the whole BDIC program.

An interesting consideration to ponder is that if the program is to be evaluated in any way, then one important factor to be considered in the program is how the type of student-faculty interaction can be effectively measured.

Question #4: Is participation in the BDIC program a factor in the reward system of your department?

In regard to Question #4, the following results were obtained:

yes 6 (24%)

not sure 12 (48%)

no 7 (28%)

Of the 24% who indicated a positive response to Question #4, all but one are actively involved in non-traditional programs such as Outward Bound, Human Relations, and Community Service programs.

The 48% who weren't sure felt that it should play an important part, but were unable to tell how much.

The 28% who said it is not now a factor in the reward system also felt that it should play a part in the reward system.

Comment: It is interesting to note that of the seven faculty who said it did not play a role in their department's reward system, six were in traditional academic departments in the college of Arts and Sciences.

It would seem that any attempt to expand or improve the program should consider possible mechanisms to facilitate student-faculty interaction and incorporate BDIC participation in the University's reward system.

Question #5: Do you have some general expectations of a student who is participating in the BDIC Program?

Of the 25 BDIC faculty sponsors interviewed, 21 (84%) answered affirmatively. Of these, 95% expected the BDIC student to be committed,

self-motivated, academically mature (above average grades), and sincere in purpose. Other individual expectations included more contact with the sponsor, a good proposal, and a strong desire for more work and greater field experience.

Three faculty members (12%) answered "no," feeling that a BDIC student was similar to any other student majoring in a particular area (sociology, history, etc.) or that the two (BDIC and non-BDIC students) could not be compared.

One faculty sponsor (4%) had no opinion on Question #5.

Question #6: Are your expectations of a non-BDIC student any different than your expectations of a BDIC student?

Of the 25 BDIC sponsors interviewed, 18 (72%) answered affirmatively with the vast majority's expectations centering around more contact with his or her sponsor, academic superiority, greater responsibility, seriousness of purpose and motivation. One sponsor felt that a BDIC student is more aggressive and another felt that his expectations did differ from a BDIC to a non-BDIC student only if the Program is successful, but he did not ennunciate the differences.

Six BDIC sponsors (24%) answered no, four of them without an explanation. The other two felt that non-BDIC students are just as happy in the Programs that they are in and are in no way different or inferior to BDIC students.

One sponsor (4%) had no opinion.

Comment: The high percentage of yes reponses (84% and 72%) to Questions #5 and #6 indicate that faculty sponsors do find qualitative differences between BDIC and non-BDIC students. This evidence seems to indicate that faculty sponsors believe the BDIC Program to be more challenging and, therefore, demand more mature and serious-minded participants.

Question #7: Have you ever or would you ever recommend the BDIC program to a student as an alternative to departmental programs?

Of the total number of respondents, 23 (92%) said that they would recommend BDIC to a student as an alternative to departmental programs.

Of those responding affirmatively, however, half of them stated that they expected the student to show some motivation and in some way question the departments' ability to meet his needs. They also made it clear that their willingness to recommend BDIC depended upon their assessment of the student in question--they would not recommend it to "just anybody." For example, one faculty member said, "Depending on the student--I have recommended against it when the student was not highly motivated or just wanted an easy way out." The other half of the positive respondents did not qualify their statements.

Those responding negatively, two (8%) stated that they did not recommend the program because the student should initiate any discussions or because they would not want to interfere in student decisions.

No one responded that they would categorically recommend against the program.

Comment: It is interesting that although some faculty members felt that their present BDIC students were not particularly successful in their programs, most faculty would not hesitate to recommend BDIC to other students. The high percentage of positive responses to this question seems to indicate considerable faculty support for the program and correlates strongly with the responses to the first question concerning the usefulness of BDIC.

Question #8: Would you sponsor more BDIC students?

Twenty five (100%) of the respondents stated that they would sponsor more BDIC students. Many, however, qualified their response immediately by stating the number of BDIC students that they were willing to take on at any one time. Five respondents indicated that they would be willing to take more than two but no more than four students; ten stated that they would not be willing to sponsor more than two students at any one time. Of the nine who did not qualify their responses, it is impossible to ascertain from our data whether they would limit the number of students they would sponsor, and if so, what number they would find acceptable.

The preponderance of the comment accompanying the responses indicates that the faculty members felt a responsibility to expend considerable time and energy with their students and therefore would not be willing to take on large numbers of BDIC students in addition to their other departmental responsibilities.

Comment: A number of people have questioned the validity of this question as it did not incorporate a time element in asking if faculty would sponsor more BDIC students, but the positive responses do seem to indicate a positive attitude on the part of the faculty toward BDIC and a willingness to expend time as sponsors. The willingness of faculty to repeat as sponsors has implications for the size of the faculty "pool" that BDIC can call upon for sponsors.

It is interesting to correlate this response to the highly ambiguous and uncertain responses to Question #4 concerning the part of participation in BDIC in the departmental reward system. Twenty-five (100%) were willing to take on more students even though 12 (44%) were not sure if it would be a factor in the reward system and seven (28%) felt that it would not. Clearly, some intrinsic rewards are involved.

Question #9: Do you feel that your teaching style has changed or you do anything differently in class as a result of your participation in the BDIC program?

Nineteen (76%) felt that their teaching style has not been significantly changed nor do they appear to conduct their classes differently as a result of participation in BDIC. Comments accompanying these negative responses ranged from, "I was flexible in courses before BDIC but I welcome the program flexibility. I embraced BDIC because of my teaching style" to "I am just more comfortable with BDIC."

Six (24%) felt that their teaching style had been changed as a result of participation in BDIC.

Two of the affirmative responses were clearly stated: (1) "I've developed a higher expectation of students in general," and (2) "Program has affected my teaching. In certain areas, I have broadened my concepts as a result of interdisicplinary focus of my student's programs." The remaining comments comprising the affirmative responses were somewhat vague and difficult to assign to the affirmative category. Subjective judgment was used in assigning the following two statements: (1) "Not absolutely sure if attributable to BDIC, but my teaching style has changed," and (2) "It's hard to say." This was construed as yes, to the extent that he understood a kind of needed vitality to this sort of work that he would not accept from other students that he might not have before BDIC (paraphrased).

Comment: Although more than three-quarters of the respondents indicated no significant change in their teaching style or a change in the way they conduct their classes, the fact that teaching styles were changed and classes are conducted differently for four (16%) as a result of BDIC should be helpful in evaluating the program.

It should be noted that one of the three respondents requested anonymity be given his response in the final report. Additionally, all three of the respondents requested the information and final report be provided to them for perusal.

Question #10: Have you become involved in any joint teaching or team teaching projects or any special problems courses as a result of your involvement in the BDIC program?

Nearly three-quarters, 18 (72%), of the respondents did not extend their teaching into joint teaching or special problems courses as a result of their involvement in the BDIC program.

About one-quarter, six (24%), of the respondents, however, indicated that BDIC contributed to joint teaching, team teaching or special projects.

One faculty sponsor had no opinion on question 10.

Comment: Although nearly three-quarters of the respondents indicated that BDIC involvement did not generate joint teaching, team teaching or special projects endeavors on their behalf, the fact that one out of four BDIC respondents sample is behaving differently with regard to teaching involvement as a result of BDIC may be helpful in evaluating the effects of the program.

It should be noted that one of the respondents requested anonymity be given his response in the final report. Additionally, all three of the respondents requested the information and final report be provided to them for perusal.

Question #11: In your opinion does the Director manage the program effectively?

In response to this question, 18 (72%) indicated that the Director managed the program effectively or very effectively while five (20%)

indicated that they could not judge and assumed that the program was managed effectively, while two (8%) of the respondents indicated that the program was managed poorly.

The comments from the 72% who were enthusiastic of their appraisal of the management included:

"I don't know how much more effectively the program could be administered."

"Arthur Kinney has infinite patience and enthusiasm."

"Kinney does an excellent job of following up on the program."

Eight percent of the 72% indicated that although the program was managed effectively, the operation seemed to close down at certain times during the summer months.

Both individuals (8%) who were critical of the management of the program were quite vocal in stating their position. Their comments included:

"I think the Director is too easy going."

"He doesn't seem to be critical of students' programs."

"He sees his role as that of student advocate and sees the faculty as a rival to this role."

"Kinney is evasive and insensitive."

Of the people interviewed regardless of whether they felt that the program was well managed or not, there were three (12%) who felt that the program was not well managed in its formative years and that management has improved since then. One individual indicated that the turnabout occurred as recently as two months ago.

Question #12: Do you feel that the Director is accessible? Is the staff?

In response to this question, 17 (68%) indicated that the Director was accessible, 4 (16%) assumed that he was accessible but had never contacted him and 4 (16%) indicated that they did not know or that they had no basis to form a judgment.

Comments: It is difficult to ascertain why 8 (32%) of the respondents did not feel any need to communicate with the Director, but one possibility is that the impetus for communication is on the student and he is the ingredient that binds the Director and the faculty advisor together. It is also interesting to note that of the respondents who indicated that the Director and the staff were accessible, eight percent again complained that they were not as accessible during the summer when he or she had occasion to call the Director or the staff. It should be emphasized at this point that there were no direct critical comments of the staff.

If one were to make some gross generalizations based on the survey, it would seem that the program is well managed, there is not too much red-tape, and that a significant minority of the faculty advisors have little or no contact with the Director or his staff but assume that all is well.

The one basic criticism that might be examined more closely is the question of whether or not there is sufficient accessibility during the summer.

Since three (12%) of the respondents came up with the suggestion that duplicate folders of the student's record be provided to the advisor, it is quite possible (especially in view of the fact that they came up with suggestion on their own) that other people feel this need and might respond affirmatively if they were asked this question. As a consequence, it might not prove wasteful for the Director to institute such a procedure.

One further question that might be asked is whether or not the faculty should be more concerned with management and a follow-up and whether or not the student should be the person responsible. for initiating communication since the faculty seem to feel that the student is currently responsible for this.

Question #13: Have you any suggestions for improving the program? If so, were there channels of communication available for making suggestions?

In response to this question, 20 (80%) had suggestions to offer. Of these, 11 (55%) stated that channels of communication were available. Of the total number of respondents, 15 (60%) answered "yes" to available channels of communication; the other 10 (40%) did not respond to this part of the question. No one responded negatively.

Some of the suggestions indicated were:

At the beginning of each semester, there should be a meeting scheduled for all sponsors and students to acquaint them with the rules, regulations, procedures, etc.

The program should be publicized more.

A directory of BDIC students and their sponsors should be issued, listing name, address, areas of concentration.

Students entering the BDIC program should be highly motivated, have self-discipline and a high maturity level.

Faculty advisors should get together to pool their talents.

Most suggestions were positive in nature, but there were a few people, 3 (12%) who also had criticisms. Among them were:

BDIC should be more critical of students' programs.

The program needs real policies.

BDIC caters too much to students' wants and needs.

Comment: Some of the respondents seemed to become too involved in making suggestions and as a result did not remember the second part of the question concerning channels of communication.

NOTE: In some cases the responses to Question #13 and Question #14 were reversed or combined. Three answered Questions #13 and #14 giving suggestions about needed support services. Two combined answers for these questions. Two reversed their answers. In such cases the tallies were made under the appropriate question.

Question #14: Can you indicate any support services which you feel are needed but not provided?

In response to this question, 13 (52%) indicated support services that were needed. Six of these (approximately 46% of the 13) stated that money was a much needed support service. Two (approximately 15% of the 13) indicated that more non-professional help was needed, e.g., clerical help,

duplicating services, staff in general. There were also 2 (15% of the 13) indicated that a Placement Counselor was needed, and another 2 (15% of the 13) who stated that duplicate records to sponsors was a needed support service. Another service indicated was faculty compensation for BDIC participation, e.g., work load.

Comment: It is interesting to note that 2 (8%) of the respondents indicated that duplicate records to sponsors was a needed service, especially since this suggestion was also made in response to Question #11.

Question #15: How much time do you spend with your BDIC students? Has this proved to be adequate? How much of this time is of an advising nature?

Eighteen (72%) of the respondents indicated that they spent 0-2 hours per week with their BDIC students, while 4 (16%) indicated 3-5 hours and 3 (12%) indicated more than 5 hours.

Eleven (44%) of the respondents indicated that this amount of time was adequate while 4 (16%) indicated it was inadequate. No response was received from 10 (40%) of the participants.

The amount of time used in an advising nature was indicated according to the following:

No time---------- 6 (24%)

Half of the time or less------11 (44%)

More than half of the time---- 6 (24%)

All of the time----------. 2 (8%)

Question #16: Do you feel that the University's curriculum should be restructured to allow for independent study for all students?

Four (16%) of the respondents felt that the University curriculum should be restructured to allow for independent study for all students.

Twenty-one (84%) of the respondents replied to this question in the negative with the following accompanying statements:

"Not for everyone; some students need more structure."

"Too expensive."

"BDIC should not be an alternative to curriculum modification."

"Faculty would not have required time."

"Too much of a hassle."

"Core and substantive areas needed."

"Inefficient system."

"Takes too much time unless rewards system is restructured to account for this."

Question #17: Should the BDIC program be allowed unlimited growth?

The responses to this question can be grouped in four major categories:

Unqualified Yes 3 (12%)

Qualified Yes 7 (28%)

Limited Growth 8 (32%)

No Growth 7 (28%)

A listing of the tpyical responses to the latter three categories include:

Qualified Yes

- as long as there are advisors
- if tied to rewards
- impossible, but ,es
- if faculty sponsor concept remains
- if careful screening is done
- if tied to departmental growth
- with periodic assessment

Limited Growth

- to accommodate highly motivated and disciplined students
- to availability of sponsors and resources
- to the extent that it proves valuable as there is still a place for traditional programs

No Growth

- growth would destroy the essential features
- financial restraints
- number of eligible students limited
- should not be considered until long-range effects are known

CONCLUSIONS/DISCUSSION BASED ON RANDOM SAMPLE OF BDIC FACULTY

As noted in an earlier section of this report, this study was undertaken to determine a) the quality of faculty orientation, b) the effect of BDIC on participating faculty and c) to solicit comments on the effectiveness of the management of the program. In reviewing the conclusions and discussion that follow, the reader should keep in mind that the evaluation instrument was an unstructured questionnaire administered through the interview technique. While previous sections of this report have treated the data objectively and responses have been categorized and reported as percentages, this section attempts to deal with the data subjectively. The inferences drawn should be considered in this light.

In attempting to determine the quality of faculty orientation, five questions were asked which related to this subject (1, 2, 3, 16, and 17). An analysis of the responses to these questions indicates that participating faculty are convinced that the program serves a useful purpose, and although there were a variety of responses as regards exactly what the purpose is, one would have to conclude that in excess of ninety percent of the faculty have a clear indication of the purpose of the program. While the terminology varies, it is also clear that the vast majority of faculty advisors perceive the program to be a method for a student to establish a course of study which has more options, greater flexibility, is individualized or somehow more unique, and perhaps is interdisciplinary in nature.

One should not be misguided, however, in reviewing the responses to these early questions since they should not be interpreted as blanket approval and support for all aspects of the program, since as we shall see, there were some critical comments on various aspects of the program. While there is consensus that the program does serve a useful purpose, any consideration of the quality of faculty orientation should not discount the sixteen percent of the respondents who indicated that the program was somehow falling short of fulfilling its

initial purpose. As noted above, there is a direct correlation between the impression the faculty advisor has of the advisee and the corresponding view of the program as a whole. If the program managers are interested in reversing this minority opinion, they could from the beginning insure that there is a certain amount of compatability between the student and his advisor, or develop more effective screening mechanisms for students and faculty, which was suggested in several of the responses. An alternative would be to initiate a training program for faculty advisors which would better prepare them to deal with the type of student with whom they are interacting in this program.

As one moves away from the current purpose of the program and faculty are queried as regards what future role this program should assume in the curriculum, there is not nearly the unanimous agreement found in discussion of current purpose and structure.

In reviewing the data one finds that only sixteen percent of the faculty advisors indicated support for restructuring the curriculum to allow for independent study for all students and only twelve percent indicated that the program should be allowed unlimited growth. An analysis of the response to these two questions indicates that the negative responses are those that fell into the realms of qualified support for expansion of the program were contingent upon several factors which focused on such words as inefficiency, time (or lack thereof), expenses, and the reward system. In other words, if any or all of these were available in unlimited supply and the reward system took into account participation in such programs, an overwhelming percentage of the respondents would favor such a system; but in view of the current situation, very few faculty advisors were willing to commit themselves to unlimited support for such a program.

Responses to the question of potential growth reflected an elitist strain when they indicated that more careful screening should be carried out in the

light of what they saw as the main purpose of the program--to accomodate highly motivated and disciplined students.

Effect of BDIC on Participating Faculty

Since questions were not asked in most cases as regards the faculty's behavior both before and after participation in the program, any conclusions about the effect of participation in BDIC on faculty advisors can only be drawn through inference.

Participation in BDIC does affect the faculty's expectation of students since a significant majority (21 or 84%) indicated that they had higher expectations. In this case "higher" would mean different qualitatively than before. Therefore, we might infer that behavior change has occurred from participation in the program.

Since the question of whether a faculty advisor would have recommended the program before participation in the program was not asked, it is impossible to determine if the ninety-two percent who would currently recommend the program would have recommended it prior to their role as advisors. When one reviews the responses to the questionnaires as a whole and the generally positive feeling that advisors expressed about the program, it would be reasonable to suggest that participation in the program has resulted in the faculty wishing to recommend the program and to sponsor more students.

There would seem to be an effect of participation in the program on teaching style, since sixteen percent of the faculty interviewed responded affirmatively to this question, and twenty-four percent indicated that they had become involved in joint teaching projects. Whether or not the pedagogical fallout is as high as was anticipated by the initiators of the program is impossible for the investigators to determine since effect on teaching style

is not included as a program objective. What must also be considered is that subtle changes may have occurred that were not noticed by the faculty members themselves. Changed behavior could perhaps be best commented on by the students who were exposed to these professors both before and after their participation in BDIC.

Participation in BDIC does definitely have an effect on participating faculty in terms of the amount of time that they spend on the job during the week. While it is true that a sample was not obtained of faculty who did not participate in BDIC, nor were the interviewees asked to break down their time both before and after participation in the program, there was a clear indication by over half of the respondents that the time spent on the program is over and above the time that they allocate to their departmental programs. This response is even more interesting when we consider that the question was not asked and that this information was volunteered.

Effectiveness of Program Management

A review of question 3, which asks whether or not the program was fulfilling its purpose, reveals that forty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that they either did not know (thirty-two percent) or that it did not fulfill its purpose (sixteen percent). In view of the fact that ninety-two percent of the faculty indicated that the program objectives serve a useful purpose, it would seem to suggest that a more precise statement of purpose against which the success or failure of the program can be evaluated is required. This would also suggest that the Director consider developing an instrument for determining initial faculty comprehension of the goals and objectives of the program and the development of a feedback document that would be a regularized means of communication that the faculty advisor would be urged to utilize to make suggestions for program improvement or to point out to the

Director specific areas where that individual faculty member felt that the program was falling short.

If one were to make some gross generalizations as regards the management of the program, it would seem that the program is well managed, there is not too much red tape, adequate support services are available, the Director and his staff are accessible, and that there are channels of communication available for making suggestions for program improvement. It is also significant to note, however, that a significant minority of the faculty advisors have little or no contact with the Director or staff and only assume that all is well.

Even with this glowing endorsement, there should be some followup by the administrators of the program to some of the suggestions made by the faculty. Among the more critical comments that perhaps should be examined more closely are whether or not Director and staff are sufficiently accessible during the summer months and whether the Director should be more critical of students and their programs. There were several positive suggestions that were offered and these should perhaps be reviewed not because of the high percentage of the individuals who made the suggestion but merely because they might add to an already effective program administration. Among the recurring suggestions that might bear critical review are: a) having a meeting of all sponsors at the beginning of the semester to familiarize participants with the rules and regulations of the program b) publishing a student and sponsor directory c) increased publicity d) additional screening processes for students and programs e) provision of duplicate records to sponsors and f) the possibility of hiring a placement counselor.